account of Karivu was granted to the people of South Travancore, but no relief was given to the ryots of the Northern Division on that account. He prayed that all the Divisions might be treated alike in this respect.

*Reply.*—This is the converse of subject No. 16. Relief will however be given in individual cases on the recommendation of the Peishkar.

**19. Postponement of collection of tax to the succeeding year in cases of failure of crops in Punja lands.**

*Mr. Krishnan Narayanan* (*Ampalapuzha*) said that owing to the influx of water, the Kuttanad ryots had very often to suffer from failure of crops and that no concession was given to them by Government on such occasions as in the Southern Division where remission on account of want of water-supply was freely allowed. The member requested that if Government could not find their way to grant wholesale remission in these cases, an order might be passed by which the tax might be realised at least in the succeeding year.

*Reply.*—The postponement of collection of tax will be considered in individual cases on the recommendation of the Peishkar. No general rule can be passed.

**20. Reduction of tax in localities affected by cocoanut blight.**

*Mr. Luke Koshi Vydian* (*Karunagapalli*) said that in Karunagapalli, Mavelikara and adjoining taluks cocoanut trees had become subject to some disease of a grave and malignant type whose cause or cure it was not in the power of the ryots to discover. He prayed that in view of the very poor yield from these trees during the past few years the tax on them might be reduced and the services of an expert engaged to find out the true cause of the blight and to remedy the same.

*Mr. Kesavan Padmanabhan* (*Mavelikara*) *and Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai and Mr. K. Kochu Thomman* (*Chengannur*) dwelt on the acute condition of the disease in their taluks.

*Reply.*—It has come to the notice of Government that in many taluks this disease exists and has been prevailing for some time. Some endeavours were made to trace the cause of the blight but without success. It is difficult to get down a special officer thoroughly conversant with the matter. As the taluks have been settled, no relief by way of reduction of tax can be granted. As regards the blight, the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

learned Conservator who has special knowledge of the subject was written to at my instance and he has made some suggestions. Further information will be called for and all possible steps taken towards the discovery of some remedy for the disease. Government hope to do this in the course of the year and if this is not found feasible the question of what other relief could be granted to the ryots will be considered.

**21. Suggestions regarding the number of kist instalments.**

*Mr. Narayanan Madhavan Karthavu* (*Shertallay*) said that the order of Government dated 25th July 1906 reducing the number of kist instalments from 10 to 6 worked hardship on the ryots and prayed that as before 10 instalments might be allowed for the payment of tax.

*Mr. K. Karunakaran Pillai* (*Parur*) *and Mr. P. N. Kesava Pillai* (*Quilon*) also pleaded for a reversion to the old arrangement.

*Mr. R. Nambi Iyer* (*Tovala*) requested that the 6 instalments now in vogue should be further reduced to 4 *viz.*, in the months of Thulam, Vrichigom, Meenam and Medom.

*Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi* (*Kalkulam*) said that the present number of instalments did not admit of further reduction. He observed that the majority of ryots were poor and that it would be an advantage to them if there were more instalments for the recovery of tax. The Revenue Recovery Regulation demanded interest in cases of arrears of tax and a reduction in the number of instalments would mean further loss to the cultivator in the shape of interest. The member added that the present arrangement which was only recently introduced might be given a fair trial before any further reduction was made.

*Mr. M. K. Govinda Pillai B. A., B. L.* (*Trivandrum*) supported the views of Mr. Madhavan Tampi.

*Reply.*—The question is a difficult one. You yourselves are not agreed, such difference of opinion being probably due to differences in local conditions and circumstances. The matter is under the consideration of Government in reference to the Report of the Survey Committee and the opinions of the officers concerned have been called for. Earnest consideration will be given to your valuable remarks. Government hope to arrive at a decision satisfactory to all the Divisions, consistently with the general principle not to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly